

**I-95/395 HOT Lanes PPTA**  
**Advisory Panel Meeting Agenda**  
**September 21, 2005**  
**6:00 PM**

**Approved Minutes**

Attendees:

Mr. John A. Rollison  
Mr. Charles Badger - Absent  
Ms. Barbara Reese  
Ms. Julia A. Connally  
Ms. Katherine K. Hanley  
Mr. Alfred H. Harf  
Mr. Malcolm T. Kerley, P.E.  
Mr. Ron Kirby  
Mr. Dennis Morrison  
Mr. Zeanious "Zeke" Newcomb  
Mr. Dave Ogle  
Mr. Robert E. Sevila  
Mr. Brian Smith - Absent  
Mr. Dan Tangherlini

1. Approval of July 26, 2005, Minutes.
2. Proposed agenda change for October 11, 2005, meeting.
  - a. 45-minute presentation by proposers.
  - b. 1-hour panel discussion/question session.
3. Motion for another meeting on November 1, 2005, at 7 PM at the Northern Virginia District Office. – Motion passed.
4. Financial Presentation of Clark/Shirley proposal by Barbara Reese.  
No questions/comments.
5. Financial Presentation of Fluor proposal by Barbara Reese.  
Questions:
  - a. Mr. Rollison: The different teams dealt with the possibility of variable tolls? That in fact as demand increases the facility the tolls would have to go up in order to keep the traffic flowing smoothly? How did that factor into the proposal of the two different teams?

Ms. Reese: Both of them assume variability in tolling.

- b. Ms. Hanley: I would like to see a chart or graph so that we can compare the financials in a side-by-side way because they are complicated and I read it several times to see the actual making evaluations about the same thing as a result of comparisons I would ask that we get that.

Ms. Reese: It would be helpful but let me caution you about it. The proposers are not proposing that the same thing be built.

- c. Ms. Connally: This ascending debt service is that the new way of doing things, and is this a very prudent and sound approach?

Ms. Reese: It's present in both proposals. It's an acceptable way of doing it. In the Commonwealth we typically use level debt service payments and we do have a consistent payment every year.

- d. Mr. Harf: I think I understood you to say that both proposers are counting as project revenues tolls that would be collected by virtue of the Phase VIII Springfield Interchange being constructed and that one proposer is treating this interchange project as project expense while the other is not. Is there anything inconsistent about those assumptions and the agreement that's already been consummated between Fluor and VDOT with regard to the Beltway HOT lanes?

Ms. Reese: If you look in the six-year improvement program the Springfield Phase VIII project is a separate and distinct project. While it is acknowledged in the Beltway HOT Lanes agreement, it is a separate project and it is being treated as such in the constrained long-range plan. Operationally we're going to have the same issue potentially with the Dulles Toll Road and the Capital Beltway there's a change on who will operate that facility. How are the operators if they're all different work together? It's something that we have to be addressed shortly.

- e. Mr. Harf: Is it your view that there's no double counting of any toll revenues?

Ms. Reese: When the Beltway HOT Lanes proposal evaluation was done there was no revenue from the Phase VIII project included.

- f. Mr. Kerley: What is the assumption about growth on the corridor?

Ms. Reese: We are going to be asking both proposers for much more detailed traffic information and toll information.

- g. Mr. Morrison: In the Clark Shirley proposal to fund the funding the Phase VIII Springfield Interchange project and consequently contends that \$78 million of public funding in the six-year plan will be freed up. In the Beltway HOT Lanes proposal is that going to be funded through the tolls so that also is freed up; do you remember?

Ms. Reese: It's a separate project we've got to wait for the record of decision process to see.

6. Presentation from Ron Kirby.

Questions/comments:

- a. Ms. Hanley: The traffic division coming north and going around the Beltway this is the first time I've ever seen more traffic going east on the Beltway vs. towards Tyson's and I noticed the chart says HOT lane traffic volume, correct?  
Mr. Kirby: Yes.
- b. Ms. Hanley: Is that the difference even though people can't do HOT to the east and the HOT lane folks are going to the east because I thought general traffic problems -- No. 2 was going towards Tyson's?  
Mr. Kirby: That's what this analysis shows and some of these things we need to go back and see where they're going.
- c. Ms. Hanley: When you do the Parkway on the analysis is that the Parkway part that's there now or are you assuming the Parkway interchange will be there if we can ever get that interchange going?  
Mr. Kirby: What's in there is whatever was scheduled for 2010.
- d. Ms. Hanley: If we get formula money for HOV lanes and San Diego is getting formula money for HOT lanes with those requirements if we have extension of lane miles in HOT lanes/HOV lanes wouldn't that extend the amount of lanes to account for formula and instead of losing money wouldn't we actually get more a); and b) if we ran a transit line wouldn't that extend our opportunity to get more and we'd have to do it.  
Mr. Kirby: Right.
- e. Ms. Hanley: Is the region at risk of failing to meet air quality?  
Mr. Kirby: The air quality analysis indicates that the region will be able to comply with the requirements.
- f. Ms. Hanley: No emissions problems with HOT lanes?  
Mr. Kirby: No.
- g. Mr. Ogle: Just for clarity on slide 7 it talks about the variable toll rates that were needed for the first segment but it doesn't specify the toll to get on the I-95 portion of it. It just says per mile. Is that per mile toll?  
Mr. Kirby: It does say it. It says peak period tolls per mile.
- h. Ms. Connally: On Page 14 there are references to traffic volumes with HOV and tolled vehicles -- could you just review the significance of that?  
Mr. Kirby: I think what's interesting about that slide is that if you just look up from the bottom from the Route 17 Bypass you'll see a virtual

wall of traffic there that is all HOV folks who are getting on heading north. There's very little toll-paying vehicles because they're not getting something out of it. As you move to the north congestion starts to develop and you start to see right around Dumfries there toll-paying people coming in fairly large numbers. As you move further north congestion starts to develop and you start to see right around Dumfries there a toll-paying people coming in fairly large numbers and you also see the HOV numbers starting to grow as more and more HOV people join in the facility. And the interesting thing is what's the mix at any one point and this, you know, suggests that down at the bottom it's mostly HOV. As you move further north the toll-paying people become a large part of the mix. When you get to the Beltway it's about fifty/fifty and then it varies a little bit up and down to the north. The HOVs that are in the parts of the facility where you've got high volumes and congestion in the other lanes the HOVs are right around half the traffic, so very substantial.

- i. Ms. Connally: This assumes there's capacity for those wanting to use the lanes.  
Mr. Kirby: Yes and this is a reasonable assumption because tolls are set so that the lanes are free flowing.
- j. Mr. Tangherlini: Forty-two percent go to the City and I think some of the eastbound traffic may be heading to 295 and throughout so I'd like to explore that issue. But in working on this do you assume the continuation of the HOV lanes across the 14th Street Bridge and the rest --  
Mr. Kirby: That's correct.
- k. Mr. Tangherlini: Wouldn't the use of HOT lanes by HOVs be higher closer in if the HOV continued across the Bridge 14th Street?  
Mr. Kirby: That they could well be as, you know, the model computes the traffic volume and delay that people experience when they get onto the Bridge. And at some point that's going to discourage people from making that a part of their trip.
- l. Mr. Tangherlini: So you say there's a choke point.  
Mr. Kirby: It's a choke point here.
- m. Mr. Tangherlini: Will we be able to increase the tolls closer to the 14th Street Bridge span if it is included so you can raise all the tolls on segment 1 in order to make it more reliable and faster? Would you have been able to determine the tolls?  
Mr. Kirby: Perhaps if there were more capacity there and there was less need to toss people out.

- n. Mr. Tangherlini: So would it be fair to assume then that people in essence are willingness to pay a toll for those additional lanes for the 14<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge?

Mr. Kirby: You can argue that way.

- o. Mr. Kerley: Once you get across the 14th Street Bridge where am I? Is that the choke point?

Mr. Kirby: In the Nation's capital. Well, probably there are a number of different roadways you can get onto once you get through but there's not many ways of getting across the river. There's only one right there and you try and get across on those two lanes pretty much.

- p. Mr. Tangherlini: We haven't during this analysis looked at the potential impact of BRAC or even the potential impact of demand from BRAC?

Mr. Kirby: Right.

- q. Ms. Connally: Although both proposals improve capacity could you just expand a little bit on your observation on the importance of the transit component?

Mr. Kirby: If we're able to set this up so it really can maintain a very high level of service through there I would think bus services would be very effective and you'd get plenty of good ridership.

- r. Ms. Hanley: Increased transit helps meet the air quality requirement.

Mr. Kirby: Right.

7. Break

8. Public comment.

9. Closing Comments by Advisory Panel Members:

Ms. Hanley: I just want to address what we heard. I would like to have some response from the State on a couple of things. First, I thought I heard Ron Kirby quoted as having said and let's go back -- something that was said about how HOV wouldn't survive and I think I need to know what that was. I missed that and I'd like to surely know exactly what that quote is. Ron, did you hear it?

Mr. Kirby: Yes. That was in relation to discussion on the Beltway project some considerable time ago and was in relation to whether the road was actually built. It was not related to this project.

Ms. Hanley: The other two things that I'd like to know and ask one of our evaluations -- and I mean really Northern Virginia -- what might -- well, first I heard some really populous kinds of things that I appreciate the process and I think many of us that are involved in the process have had questions about the PPTA process as well. And so I think my understanding is that it's been delegated to this kind of process by the General Assembly -- by your elected officials and that's the elected officials determined that that's what this process would be and,

Barbara, if someone could give a sheet of paper on why the process is the way it is. I think that would be very useful because I share to some extent that concern but this is the law. This is the regulation as operate under, even those of us on the Commonwealth Transportation Board are bound within this law. And thirdly, I'd like to ask if we could have an evaluation of the options. We've heard a lot about guaranteeing that there will always be HOV and I think that's a question that we're going to have a grapple with and I entertain some options as to how that could be done so that there would not be -- so the HOV portion which is so important - - this is the best one in the country -- the would, in fact, be there. And so I would be interested in how you might do that because that is I think an important part of transportation in the corridor -- HOV to start with.

Ms. Connally: I was again struck by the interested in preserving the HOV as the important option here but I also heard that there was a need to look at this as a system, as a mobility system not strictly as a highway. And to consider how it relates to not only the Beltway but someone mentioned I think about the 14th Street and also how transit can work in this to make it really a mobility system for this region that really relies on ability to get from here to D.C. or to Dulles and so vitally important.

Mr. Tangherlini: My name is Dan Tangherlini. I'm the director of the District of Columbia Department of Transportation so the person that was asking if I came from Richmond I'd like to say I'm from another capital. But we're very interested as a recipient for some of that forty-two percent of the traffic that's up 395 in making sure that there is a full system in the regional transportation so much use and occupy District of Columbia roads. Seventy percent of cars on our roads during the day are registered outside of the District of Columbia and that's a huge demand placed on a city with no additional tax receipts received from the occupants and drivers of those vehicles. So we're very interested in seeing a solution that bring resources to the table regionally that encourage mass transit opportunities, to expand ride sharing opportunities and other opportunities like that and that's why I'm here on this panel and am interested in what I've heard tonight.

Mr. Sevilla: I was impressed also by the number of commuters who have testified tonight against the HOT lanes. It's obvious to me that they're motivated primarily by the fear that the HOT lanes are going to be incentive for single occupant vehicles crowding out the opportunity for them to commute. And I've got to ask our Advisors if we have some experience with California and Texas and Minnesota where this has been done do those kinds of things happen? How often and when can we anticipate that there might be those kinds of problems on the I-95 HOT lane?

Mr. Rollison: Any other comments or questions? Well, I'll conclude by saying I think what I heard tonight that the main concern is a very strong and heartfelt concern for many people is that we protect the HOV system and be able to provide and continued operation of the slug system which was adamantly pointed out earlier sprang not from the government's idea but from the private sector and has been very successful. And the concern I have which has not been mentioned tonight and that is the HOV lanes as they exist now are in some places reaching

capacity and in the near future and certainly in the distant future will reach capacity. What concerns me is what can we do to make sure that the HOV lanes as they exist today do not reach that capacity, slow down to the same as the general purpose lanes. If that happens the slugging system that you know -- someone mentioned that was a utopia -- was a large factor of utopia that he talked about will cease to exist and won't be quite the utopia. So my concern is how do we expand this capacity of those HOV lanes? How do we expand the capacity of those HOV lanes when the transportation trust funds doesn't have the funds to build the project? So the concern I have is that we balance a way to finance \$1 billion worth of construction in a way that will allow the future success and expansion and very successful HOV system that exists today and then should be allowed to exist for our friends in Stafford and Fredericksburg area which does not exist today. The \$1 billion that it cost to build a project of that magnitude is nowhere in the funding constraints of the Department of Transportation. It's not been identified and the fact that we have private companies that are willing to place their capital at risk and build a project like this is significant. But the challenge that we have is to balance the needs the financing and bankroll a project while at the same time we maintain the status of our HOV and look for ways to expand on that mass transit opportunities.

#### 10. Adjournment.